

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion DETROIT

Volume III, No. 13

July 26, 1943

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

An International Christian Round Table

OUR last issue announced an International Round Table of Christian Leaders held at Princeton, July 8-11. In another column of this issue appear excerpts from its findings.

The holding of the conference was, in itself, an achievement of some significance. The participants included over sixty representatives from fourteen nations, embracing not only the principal powers and subjugated peoples of the United Nations but also Germany and Japan. Christians from the latter countries, while trusted by leaders of the other nations for their rejection of the policies of the German and Japanese Governments, were able to interpret the long run needs of their peoples and the aspirations of Christians now in Germany and Japan. The necessity of a victory for the United Nations was assumed throughout. The discussions were characterized by frankness and a genuine attempt to take a view of the future that would be fair to the peoples on both sides of the conflict. The Round Table was unofficial and commits no churches to any of its conclusions, but it was the most representative gathering of Christians which has assembled since the outbreak of this war, and it demonstrated to an amazing extent the effectiveness of the perspective of Christian faith in overcoming the pressures of national interest and the passions of war.

The conference was significant further in marking at least two important steps forward in the ecumenical discussion of post-war plans—its conclusions concerning the future of Germany and its attitude toward Russia. It is not possible at this time to quote directly from the reports on these issues but an attempt will be made to give their substance.

It was emphasized that any policies toward Germany should be fair to the 260,000,000 non-Germans in Europe. Nothing should be allowed to hide the enormity of the crimes committed in the name of Germany or to shield from punishment those who are most responsible for them. But in the papers that were presented to the conference and in the discussion, it was constantly emphasized that there is another Germany that is not represented by Hitler. The object of Christians in the United Nations should be to help Germany under new leadership to take her place as an equal among the nations of the

world as soon as possible, to do all that can be done to strengthen the recuperative forces within Germany and particularly to strengthen the German churches. Emphasis was laid in the findings of the Round Table upon the success of the German churches in maintaining their coherence and continuity during the war and on the contribution that they can be expected to make to the post-war world.

The same spirit characterized the discussions and the findings concerning the future of Japan. The very large Chinese delegation makes this fact the more significant. It was held that Japan must relinquish not only territory occupied during the present war but also Manchuria, Korea and Formosa. But it was declared that, if Japan does surrender part of her empire, the United Nations have the obligation to assure her export markets to enable her to adjust her economy to the needs of her people. Japan must be given adequate reason to hope for an economic revival and for full admission into the family of nations. Moreover the United Nations should not seek to impose upon Japan from outside any conditions as to her form of government. Their policy should be such as to encourage the emergence of liberal and moderate elements which would cooperate with plans for a world order of free peoples.

There was some embarrassment in the fact that Russia was singled out for special consideration but it was felt that both the people of Russia and the people of the democracies know well enough that the relations between the democracies and Russia do constitute a problem of great difficulty and of crucial importance. It is true that the findings concerning Russia do not fully represent the mind of the Ecumenical Church. But they are an honest statement of the convictions of the vast majority of the members of this Round Table and they are a new factor of which future ecumenical discussion will take account. It was emphasized that the Russian Revolution is one of the great facts of our time, that many of its results point the way for the whole world, that it has been characteristic of revolutions to be hostile to the established institutions of religion, that if Christian people seek by deeds to achieve many of the social ends of the Russian Revolution, the differences of a religious and ideological nature between

the Russians and ourselves may tend to disappear and that if they do not disappear, the prospects of world order will be dark. In other words the policy of a frontal attack upon communism on religious or ethical grounds was completely abandoned and the emphasis was laid upon an inner change in the social objectives of the democracies. It was asserted that the policy of the Russian Government concerning the territorial integrity of neighboring countries depends upon both Russia and ourselves. That policy will be determined in part by the degree to which Russia feels secure and her feeling of security will depend upon the existence or non-existence of an international order. It was also emphasized that Christians everywhere are deeply concerned about full freedom of religion in Russia, freedom that goes beyond that now provided by the Constitution, to include the right to propagate the Christian faith. And concern was felt by all for the fate of the people of the Baltic countries and eastern Poland.

That last concern needs greater emphasis in the churches. It is a gain that we are more open to the values partially realized through the Russian Revolution. It is a gain for churchmen to oppose so decisively the forces that seek to undermine future collaboration with Russia. But it is important to avoid the temptation to whitewash Russia in our zeal for

these things and to guard against callousness to the fate of peoples who share our love of political liberty and religious freedom.

J. C. B.

A Double Number

ANTICIPATING the omission of two issues of *Christianity and Crisis* during late August and early September, the present number is double our normal size. It deals largely with recent important developments in the relations of the churches to planning for the post-war world. Professor Bennett's article appraises an emerging ecumenical Christian consensus on underlying principles. Dr. Cavert discusses attitudes of Continental Christians toward the peace as he discovered them through conversations in Geneva last autumn. Dr. Herman casts a floodlight upon present realities within the German churches, drawing upon highly important material recently received through confidential sources, and supplements Dr. Iglehart's picture of Christianity in Japan in our last issue. Dr. Niebuhr gives his impressions of British thought. The editorial and news columns report the recent international Christian conference at Princeton. Bishop Oxnam describes the most ambitious and notable plan of a particular communion to bring these issues before the church people of America in the coming months. H. P. V. D.

Politics and Religion in Britain

LONDON, JUNE 17TH.

As my visit to Britain draws to a close I have been trying to sort out the most significant impressions which jostle for recognition in one's mind in a journey like this, when every day brings the opportunity to gain some new perspective upon the the mind and the heart of a country.

On the social and political situation I think my most outstanding impression is a sense of the unity of Britain. I do not mean the war-time unity which every belligerent nation achieves to some degree. I mean that Britain has today, to an even greater degree than before, a larger common denominator among all classes than any other modern nation. I have felt this strongly in the past but the impression has been reinforced. In a recent discussion with one of the most prominent Americans in Britain, a man who understands the nation well, we agreed that it would be difficult for Americans fully to understand the particular flavor of this unity. It expresses itself in a common acceptance of certain social standards; in the unchallenged preservation of certain democratic rights which in America are still subject to challenge by special groups; and in a freedom from acrimony in the political struggle. This latter point makes the attacks upon the Roosevelt administration in America almost incomprehensible to Britons. It prom-

ises certain things for the future, as for instance the acceptance of the idea that a nation is obligated to preserve minimal standards of security for all the people (as defined in the Beveridge report). Of course there will be a rigorous debate on how much or how little of that report shall be adopted. But there will be no debate upon the principle.

Every nation has the defect of its own virtues, and I sometimes feel that too great reliance is placed upon this national unity by the middle class sections of the population, and perhaps also by the churches. Particularly because the unity is accentuated in war-time there are people who give themselves to the illusion that party conflict is a thing of the past. This is a dangerous illusion because party rivalry (whatever its perils and vices) is democracy at work. For democracy requires a continual and creative debate between advocates of various possibilities which lie open to any community. While the Labor Party is not exactly revolutionary in Britain, the middle class community probably overestimates its docility. Recently a group of Manchester business men produced a widely heralded manifesto in which they called for a reconstruction of Britain upon the basis of "Christian principles." However, they did not specify just how these principles were to be implemented in exact political and economic terms. Signifi-

cantly, the trade unions of the city refused cooperation on the ground that, however much they respected the Christian integrity of their employers (a real enough respect which probably is deeper than anything known among us) they knew very well that the ideas of reconstruction held by labor on the one hand and the business community on the other varied too widely to make cooperation at this point possible. There are probably readers of *Christianity and Crisis* who would resent this attitude of the trade unions; but I think it was on the whole a wholesome attempt at realism in a situation in which there may be too many attempts at a premature unification of the nation.

In the realm of international relations, it is quite obvious that Britain for a long time will be in debate and tension on the relative merits of the American and the Russian partnerships. I think the best thought will seek to work out a creative relationship in which not too much is sacrificed to either the one side or the other of this complex partnership between three great nations. It may appear at first blush that the left will favor Russia and the right will favor America. But more likely there will be a division on this matter on both right and left. For there are conservatives who are afraid of American power and there are labor people who hate communism and would prefer to trust a democracy.

Among liberal people who are not strongly dominated by political considerations I find many who are affronted by what they regard as America's blindness to the creative aspects of British imperialism. They think Americans too easily identify imperialism with exploitation and do not appreciate to what degree the British Commonwealth of nations represents a great political achievement. Some of them would include in the achievement not merely the commonwealth part of the empire but also some of the work done in the colonies. They rightly feel that our judgments upon these issues are indiscriminate and that we hardly know where Britain has failed and where it has succeeded. At times even the most friendly American may feel that his British friends are too inclined to interpret empire in purely moral terms and to suggest that nothing but a high sense of moral responsibility could prompt them to bear the imperial burdens which they bear. But if this should be the case, it would be no more than a natural compensation for the indiscriminate criticism from which they have suffered.

The real fact is that the greatest probable hazard to Anglo-American relations in the future derive from the different forms of power which the two nations have developed. We shall be the dominant power economically, and Britain will be dominant politically in the sense that its empire gives it more centers of strategy in global politics than we have. We shall be inclined to be critical of political imperialism and uncritical of the perils which inhere in our economic power. Britain on the other hand will be critical of our economic imperialism and less critical of its traditional political imperialism. If each can stop repenting for the sins of the other and repent for our own sins, we can solve this problem. But of course that kind of repentance requires a very high form of Christian grace.

I have written on several other occasions about the religious life of the country. Having, since my previous reports, spoken with many leaders and parsons in both

the Anglican and Free Churches I should like to add a word of caution on the question of church unity. It is quite obvious that the "Religion and Life" movement has brought the churches together as never before. This does not mean that the cooperation is greater than in America but rather that it is beginning to equal our various forms of cooperation. It exceeds our own efforts only at the point of including Roman Catholics in some of the "Religion and Life" programs. This cooperation is, I believe, unknown in any other part of the world.

I do not think that it ought to be assumed that any great advance has been made in the direction of bridging the chasm between the Established and Free Churches. Undoubtedly Dr. Temple's leadership in this field of cooperation is very important and will ultimately bear fruit. Nevertheless, I have found a good deal of reserve among Free churchmen, who feel that nothing of importance has yet been accomplished because the basic conflict between essentially Protestant and essentially Catholic conceptions of the Church, the Sacraments and the ministry defies any solution thus far offered. This chasm is partly one between the Anglican and the Free Churches and it is partly a conflict within the Anglican Church in which the more Protestant wing desires greater unity with non-conformity and the Anglo-Catholic wing makes this unity as difficult as possible.

The point at issue is very clear in the matter of intercommunion. Upon that issue even the Anglicans who are not Catholics are inclined to maintain that full fellowship in the Sacrament must wait upon the organic union of the churches while the Free Churches naturally interpret the Sacrament more transcendently. They would like it to be the symbol of the unity of the Church in Christ, beyond and above the fact that the visible Church is broken by historic differences. I confess that I see no resolution of this difference, though I think both sides are quite right in hoping that practical fellowship may create the condition in which an ultimate solution will be found. Meanwhile an essentially Catholic interpretation of the relation of the Sacrament to the "body of Christ" even by those who are most generous in holding out the hand of fellowship to the Free Churches inevitably destroys the sense of full partnership for the latter. One sometimes has the feeling that the problem of bridging the chasm between American and British culture is less difficult than that of bridging the gap between Catholic and Protestant piety. This latter problem is complicated by the fact that Anglicanism is actually such a bridge. Therein lies its genius and its defects. For the question which always confronts Anglicanism is whether, in extending its fellowship so that it will include that form of Protestantism which has not been historically associated with it and which has not been brought into the "prayer book piety" which holds Anglicanism together, it may not cease to reach to the Catholic side of the chasm. The fear that the bridge may break apart or may lose a base on one side while it secures a broader base on the other obviously haunts the policy of Anglicanism.

I do not pretend to have an answer for these perplexing problems. I do think it important that the perplexities be fully explored and not prematurely covered up in the interest of brotherliness.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR.

An Ecumenical Consensus

JOHN C. BENNETT

ONE of the most serious limitations in discussions by Christians of the post-war world is that so few contributions to the discussion have come from outside the United States and the British Commonwealth. A recent document prepared in Geneva by the Study Department of the World Council of Churches in some measure helps us to overcome this limitation.¹ Throughout the war the Geneva office of the World Council has been able to keep in close contact with the churches in Germany and in the occupied countries, especially those of Western Europe, as well as Britain and America. We can be confident that we have here the result of a careful investigation of the tendencies of thought in many of the silent churches of Europe by men who were already fully informed concerning the background of those tendencies.

The form of this document should be understood. It sets forth eleven common affirmations which have behind them a consensus of opinion. After each affirmation, the differences of opinion that still remain either in regard to the theological background of that affirmation or in regard to its practical implementation are presented. Since the affirmations are common to both Anglo-Saxon and Continental thought, the glimpses that we gain of the latter come in the expositions of the differences. There has been ample opportunity to take German thought into account. It is often possible to spot a particular expression of opinion as British (in regard to colonies, for example) or as showing the influence of Karl Barth, or as representing a distrust of democracy that is known to exist among German Protestants.

The eleven points of the consensus are:

1. The Church has a specific task in relation to peacemaking and the creation of international order.
2. The Church performs its task in this realm by being itself a world-wide fellowship under one Lord in which national differences are transcended.
3. The Church is to announce to the nations that Jesus Christ is Lord over all men and all powers.
4. The Church is to proclaim the divine commandments concerning the order which is to reign in the world.
5. The Church is to call the nations to repentance for their common guilt and to work for their reconciliation.

6. The Church is to proclaim that international relations must be subordinated to law.
7. The Church is to proclaim that the State is neither an aim in itself nor a law unto itself and that its God-given function is to maintain an order based on law which guarantees fundamental human rights.
8. The Church is to proclaim that political power must be exercised with a sense of responsibility toward all those who are affected by that power.
9. The Church is to proclaim that society must provide all of its members with the opportunity to fulfill a meaningful vocation and that it should provide conditions of social security for all.
10. The Church is to proclaim that the nations are interdependent and that they are all to share in the resources of the earth.
11. The Church is to proclaim that no people can claim the right to rule over another people, and that the dominating purpose of colonial administration must be to prepare colonial peoples for self-government.

II

The most significant trend that is revealed by this analysis is that it presupposes throughout the importance of the responsibility of Christians and of churches for the structures of social life. This is in line with all the reports of the ecumenical conferences which preceded the war, but the fact that this document comes out of the heart of the European Continent and that it was written by those in closest contact with the theological positions which have often seemed to undercut Christian social responsibility gives this document added value as evidence. The following sentences are, from this point of view, the most remarkable in the document:

"The doctrine, which has for long dominated Christian thought and life, that the Lordship of Christ is to be conceived as confined to the realm of the 'inner life,' and that it has no bearing on public life, is discredited. Discussions between advocates of a 'social' gospel and those of an 'individual' gospel are largely a matter of the past. The Bible has again taught us that the Lordship of Christ is all inclusive and universal. . . . Viz-a-viz of idolatrous conceptions of state, race or class, the pre-war ecumenical gatherings have clearly condemned the heresy which declares public life to be an autonomous realm following immanent laws of its own, and this witness has been confirmed by the stand of the churches during the war, very particularly by the stand of several of the suffering churches. This ecumenical

¹ "The Church and International Reconstruction," obtainable from the American office of the World Council (297 Fourth Ave., New York City).

menical consensus concerning the claim of Christ to rule in all areas of life contains great promise for the future." (p. 9)

A second gain registered in this document is that the churches seem to be on the way to a realization that God is at work in establishing an international order that will perform on a world scale some of the functions which Protestant theology has identified with the national state. The belief in the necessity of an international political and legal structure pervades the whole document. Under the sixth affirmation, for example, it is said that "the anarchy of competing and unrestrained national sovereignties must be overcome and international authority must be created to declare the law and to enforce it." (p. 14) One of the curious lags in Protestant theology has been the assumption that the state is God's chief instrument in dealing with the anarchical results of human sin though it has long been evident that the sovereign state is itself a source of disastrous international anarchy. This document adds to the evidence of a real development of theology at this point. One can go further and say that the kind of experience and thought which underlie this document point to a more dynamic view of what have been called "the orders of creation" in Protestant theology. It is not enough to see the providence of God as it is shown in the structures of life that already exist. We may see it in the new structures that have been made necessary by the catastrophic results of anarchy in an interdependent world. We see also the necessity of human cooperation with God in the development of this new order.

A third gain in this consensus is that even those Christians who have suffered at the hands of the aggressors in this war (one author of this document is Dutch) insist that the Church should "call the nations to repentance for their common guilt." To be sure, after that is said, serious differences appear but it is said as part of the consensus: "such a confession of universal guilt excludes the attributing to one nation of the *sole* guilt for the present world catastrophe." Each Church is to emphasize the "injustices and the crimes committed by the nation for which it feels responsible and whom it represents before God." It is added: "thus also the passionate hatred which exists in the hearts of many peoples can gradually be overcome." (pp. 12-13) It is a moral triumph for the Church in the heart of Europe to say such a word as this.

III

There are three fundamental religious and theological differences which appear in the analysis. They were to be expected and I am surprised that the first has been whittled down as much as is the case.

One of these is well summarized under the first affirmation: "Some hold that this task [in relation to peacemaking and the creation of international order] consists exclusively in reminding nations of the divine commandments and in protesting against manifest violations of the commandments. Others hold that this task includes also the interpretation of the commandments in terms of concrete policies." (pp. 6-7) The first group represents the fear of losing the distinctive Christian message by confusing it with programs of action which belong to the temporal order and which involve all the relativities of politics. The second group, familiar enough to us in America, has learned from its own experiments in direct social action and so they are here made to say: "The Church is not to deal with technical matters, for which it does not have the necessary expert knowledge." (p. 7) Actually there isn't much difference between the two positions as worded here. Also, there is in both cases a serious ambiguity in the use of the word, Church. There has been developed in recent years a technique according to which men with authority and influence in the Church can give Christian guidance for concrete problems without confusing that guidance with the essential truth of the Gospel and without denying to others in the Church the right to differ. Such semi-official activity on the part of the Church might not necessarily be condemned by the first group.

The difference which has been expressed here goes deeper than the words suggest; it is really a difference in emphasis in what is called in this document "the hierarchy of issues," a difference which in practice may be so great that it will often make cooperation difficult. If the Church really reminds the nations of the divine commandments and protests against manifest violations of them, and if it trains its members to perform its positive task of reconstruction through their respective vocations, its activity should satisfy the most enthusiastic believer in "social action." But it would be easy to deal with the commandments in an abstract way and to fail to discover the most important violations. Social conservatism entrenched in the Church will be more important than the theological theory about the function of the Church.

The second theological difference concerns what we may expect in this world. As it is phrased here it is the difference between those who wait for the return of Christ and the future manifestation of his Lordship, and those who believe that Christ's Lordship over history is already evident and that it will become increasingly a reality. Those who wait for Christ's return may be millennialists of the more literalistic sort or they may hold to a highly sophisticated eschatology which does not give much content in advance to the fulfillment of history of which Christ's

return is the symbol. In either case there is a strongly pessimistic view of what can be realized in terms of human progress in this world. Those who take the more optimistic view range from uncritical Utopians who are now much chastened to those who live with hope concerning the future but who realize that progress is always accompanied by the threat of judgment. The difference here is greater than in the first case but in spite of the difference cooperation should be possible. As the more pessimistic statement puts it: "Precisely because the Church is aware of His actual Lordship [in spite of the fact that it is hidden from those who lack faith] and of its cosmic significance, it cannot but proclaim it to the whole world and call upon all powers, all groupings of men, and all individuals to recognize their true position—as powers who must choose between obedience and disobedience, and who dare not live and act as if the Resurrection had not taken place." (p. 10).

The third theological difference has to do with the controversy concerning revelation and general morality or "natural law." The extreme position is "that the Church is to proclaim only those commandments which it finds in the Biblical revelation." (p. 12) This position is maintained for religious reasons, to safeguard the sovereignty of God, and because of a real scepticism concerning the existence of any general moral law that can be known apart from revelation. This is one of the points where Karl Barth is still intransigent. All forms of Catholicism and most Protestants, except the extremists of whom Barth is the representative, reject this position and recognize that the Christian revelation is confirmed by natural morality, and that there is what John Baillie calls a "highest common factor" between the high minded secularist or the adherent of some other religion and the Christian and that this "highest common factor" forms an essential basis for cooperation in the world today. Some allowance for the necessity of such cooperation between Christians and non-Christians is made in the statement of the position which rejects natural law in these words, "it [the Church] must, whenever concrete ethical choices arise, take a common stand *ad hoc* on these specific social and political issues with those who take such a stand for other than Christian reasons." (p. 12)

IV

The differences that have to do with the practical implementation of these common affirmations can only be mentioned. There is a difference between those who believe that the peace should have in it a penal element and those who insist that common repentance excludes the possibility of punishing any nation. Those who believe that the "the moral condemnation of the wrong done by a nation must find

expression in order that the nation may learn its lesson" also believe that all that is done "should have in view the ultimate good of the people concerned" and that as soon as hostilities cease "reconciliation is to begin in the restoration of relations between the churches concerned." (p. 13)

There is a difference concerning the inclusiveness of any world organization. Some believe that it should be limited to those nations which have a common ethos and that gradually it should be enlarged to include other nations as they become fitted for membership. Others believe that it would be unwise at the start to make such distinctions among nations. This difference is complicated by another concerning the extent to which full fledged democratic institutions should be required of participating nations. Three problems emerge here: (1) the status of the Axis nations; (2) the relationship of Russia to the Western democracies; (3) the problem as it appears to many Germans who do not believe that democracy should be universalized after the war. It is probably the Germans who feel most keenly that "an authoritarian regime which accepts the limitations imposed by law . . . , respects the relative autonomy of the main social and political units, does not impose any ideology, and allows its citizens as much freedom as is compatible with public order is not to be condemned as contrary to Christian principles." This difference between those who believe that only democratic institutions can guard man's essential freedom and those who believe that a constitutional, but authoritarian rule can in many cases guard such freedom best will make Anglo-Saxon Christians impatient but they will meet the problem both in the form of the Russian system (even if it is modified in the direction of constitutionalism) and in more traditional forms of power that are preferred by Roman Catholicism.

Lastly, there is a difference about colonies. The goals are the same for all and it is admitted as part of the consensus that "the Church cannot agree that colonial power be conceived as a 'right.'" The difference has to do with the interim period before it is possible for existing colonies to achieve self-government. One group calls for direct international administration of such colonies and the other for administration by the nations now responsible under stricter international regulation. This is a standing difference between American and British documents that deal with post-war problems and it is only fair for an American to say that while Americans can be more objective concerning the relationship between the imperial power and its colonies, they do not have the sense of responsibility for what a sudden change of relationship might mean to the people of the colonies, a sense of responsibility that is felt with obvious sincerity by many British churchmen.

American vs. European Thinking About the Post-War World

SAMUEL McCREA CAVERT

ONE of the clearest impressions which I brought back from a visit to the Continent of Europe last fall is that there is a wide gulf between American and continental European thinking about post-war problems. I must, of course, guard against making broad generalizations upon the basis of limited contacts during five short weeks in Switzerland and what was then Unoccupied France. But, for whatever they may be worth, certain definite conclusions emerged.

Switzerland, as a neutral island in the center of a great ocean of conflict, is a particularly favorable spot for discovering what is passing through the minds of our fellow-Christians in many countries of the Continent. The obstacles imposed by rigid war-time censorships make it almost impossible for citizens of the occupied nations or of Germany to express their views in writing, but a surprising degree of information is quietly transmitted by word of mouth from friend to trusted friend; and most of these comments at last make their way to Switzerland. These informal intimations are much too sketchy to furnish the foundation for anything like an adequate report but they at least afford partial glimpses into the thinking of European Christians.

The gulf which separates Christian thinking in the United States from Christian thinking in Europe is chiefly at this point: *we* approach the post-war period in terms of an ideal world-order of the future but *they* are preoccupied with the terrifying realities which they will face on the very first day after the bombs cease to fall.

More specifically, we begin by insisting on the necessity for a logical and comprehensive world organization. No other country has produced such a plethora of ambitious plans for a new international order. The Delaware Conference on the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace looks forward to a global federal union in which national sovereignties will be abridged. Ely Culbertson devises a regional system, with a planetary police force based on an ingenious scheme of quotas. Governor Stassen outlines a plan for a world parliament and even defines the basis of representation therein. Clarence Streit argues for "union now," beginning with America and the British Commonwealths. In these and similar proposals American hopes make a bold leap of the imagination to an international order that will mark a more or less radical break with the existing nationalistic structure.

To our fellow-Christians in Europe today this type of planning seems romantic and perfectionist. They think that we are making beautiful models of Utopia which have little or no connection with the actualities of the situation. Our European friends even suspect that many of us are so given over to luxuriating in a dream world that we fail to come to grips with the harsh and stubborn facts of the world in which we live.

All this was made vividly concrete for me in an unforgettable conversation at the home of a friend in Geneva, where a little group of Christians of diverse national backgrounds talked frankly of their hopes and fears for the post-war world. In the characteristic fashion of an American Christian I had voiced the conviction that nothing less than a new political world-structure would suffice. I had urged the reasonableness of the federal principle, insisting that some measure of sovereignty must be transferred by the national states to an international government so that there could be a political organism concerned with and responsible for the interests not merely of one people but of all. When I had finished there was a significant silence. No one took formal exception to what I had said; they simply went off on another track. They were too absorbed in immediate problems to be able to concentrate on a long-range ideal. Soon they began to pour out their own troubled concerns about the Europe in which they would find themselves after the cessation of hostilities. Here is a summary of some of the issues that were engrossing their attention:

The Swiss was worried about the prospect of a virtual invasion of his country by a vast horde of starved people who would rush from the surrounding areas to the one place where food might be found.

The Dutchman felt that the tyranny and injustice suffered by his people was engendering so much resentment that as soon as the occupation was lifted there would be a violent massacre of the Nazis in Holland.

The Swede remarked that the thing which meant sleepless nights to many of his people was the fear that after the war Communism would sweep over their country and much of the rest of Europe.

The Frenchman could see nothing better ahead for his uphappy nation than civil war.

The German foresaw that after the collapse of

the Nazi regime there would be no center of authority whatever in Germany, that one group after another would make bloody efforts to come to power in a reign of terror and that sheer anarchy would result.

The picture of post-war Europe etched into my imagination by that evening's conversation resembles a region swept by a devastating tornado or flood that has wiped out the familiar landmarks. In such a situation the first requirement is not a political assembly to settle basic issues of government but some immediate practicable projects for maintaining order, feeding the hungry, reconstructing the shattered economy and devising some measure of social stability.

My European friends wanted to know whether we American Christians, when we think about the peace, are preparing to deal with the exigent actualities or whether we are theorizing about world community in an historical vacuum. They fear that when "American super-idealists" come up against the stark realities of post-war Europe they will be so impatient and disillusioned that they will revert to isolationism instead of staying persistently on the job of solving, step by step, the concrete problems that cannot be escaped.

If our fellow-Christians in Europe are not greatly interested in our fertile formulations of a new world-order, this does not necessarily mean that they have less insight than we into what is ultimately necessary. It means that they are much closer than we to inexorable problems that cannot be postponed until some far-visioned new order has been created. They are more conscious than we that you cannot get peace by projecting plans, however perfect on paper, which nations are not really ready to adopt and to fulfil. They remind us that you cannot even convene an assembly of nations so long as disputes still rage as to what territory is comprised within certain nations and who its responsible representatives are.

The kind of questions which our European friends ask us, therefore, have to do not with our theoretical designs of world-government but with our attitude toward much more immediate and mundane matters. They want to know, for example:

(1) whether we will be willing to continue a severe rationing of our food for perhaps two years after the war in order to share it with those who will be hungrier than we;

(2) whether we will let our sons and brothers in the armed forces remain in Europe as long as may be necessary to preserve order and secure a decent degree of stability;

(3) whether we will join in putting power to enforce its judgments behind whatever new international authority may be created;

(4) whether we will forego tariffs in the interest of reestablishing world trade and economic recovery;

(5) whether, after the war, we will resist the temptation to withdraw from international efforts and will devote ourselves to winning the peace in a spirit similar to that which we have devoted to winning the war.

In addition to their preoccupation with immediate concerns there is a deeper reason why European Christians do not respond enthusiastically to the more ambitious American plans for world order. It is that Europeans are much more "realistic" in their thinking about human nature and society than we. They do not share our confidence in "ideal" schemes which take for granted a high capacity for reasonableness and goodness in mankind. The "best" plan, they say, is not the one which gives the most perfect expression of universal brotherhood, but the one which, in a very imperfect world, has the greatest wisdom about the actual possibilities. They are not much interested in plans which, as they think, fail to take sufficient account of human emotions, human frailties and human sin.

There is a clear connection between this attitude and the prevailing theological outlook. They do not think of sinful man as able to achieve any society resembling the Kingdom of God on earth. Their hopes are much more modest. They put the emphasis on securing some workable measures which will save them from the worst extremes of international anarchy. They know full well that something must be done to effect a greater degree of mutual security but they distrust the type of thinking which assumes that, granted the right form of organization, we can expect the dawn of perpetual concord and unbroken peace. Their great concern is to get some plans that will make Europe endurable for tomorrow even though they do not provide a complete solution of world organization for the centuries to come.

What are we to conclude as to the respective merits of the continental European and the American approaches to the post-war situation? Chiefly this, that each has an important but a partial part of the truth.

The Europeans are right in insisting that any workable procedure must first of all be directed toward the concrete emergency problems—social, economic, political—which will clamor for instant solution and which cannot be postponed until some elaborate international structure has been completed. Our American thinking needs to be brought "down to earth" by the more sober mood of the Europeans.

The American churches, on the other hand, are right in emphasizing the necessity for getting a long-range perspective on the international situation. Unless there is some clear discernment of the kind of

world order toward which mankind must move, the decisions about emergent problems will be lacking in faith and vision. So long as we do not get beyond the "realism" of twenty-four separate absolute sovereignties on the one small continent of Europe, so long we shall have no durable peace.

American and European Christians need, therefore, to supplement each other's insights. Otherwise it may be found that at the end of the war there is no real meeting of minds as to what the Church, as distinguished from national churches, is working for. The great desideratum is a truly ecumenical point of view—a Christian judgment not conditioned by one-sided limitations of outlook but comprehending all that thoughtful Christians in all lands have experienced and discerned. This necessity for an ecumenical view suggests that the work of the Study Department of the World Council of Churches should be greatly magnified. A much more systematic interchange of thought is called for. If Christians are to be able tomorrow to speak with more than a national voice on the problems of world order, they must take more seriously the process of ecumenical study now.

menical study now.

If this analysis of some of the differences between Christian thinking in America and on the Continent of Europe as to post-war issues seems rather discouraging, there is a more encouraging word that remains to be said: *viz*, that there is a real agreement as to the *spirit* in which the making of the peace must be approached.

In the last analysis there is only this alternative—either to hold Germany permanently under military control as a subject people, or to win the voluntary cooperation of the German people as a member of the family of nations. Doubtless most Christians in the occupied countries will demand stern safeguards against any rebirth of German military ambition. But if I may judge from the many European friends with whom I talked, even those whose nations have suffered most from the Nazi tyranny, it is the mood of reconciliation rather than of retaliation that dominates their thinking about the future place of Germany in Europe. If there is such a mood today, as I believe there is, it is a happy indication that the ecumenical spirit is surviving the strain of the war.

The Church in Germany Today

STEWART W. HERMAN, JR.

IT IS high time to record for the benefit of Christian circles in America which are all too prone to regard Christians in Germany as "slackers," a few of the major achievements of the German Church.

At the moment of writing it is just exactly one year since the good ship *Drottningholm* docked in the Hudson River and put a period to my six-year pastorate among the Americans resident in Berlin. Since then I have zealously employed both the oral and the written word¹ to describe the nature of German religiosity, the vicious assaults of Nazism on the Christian Church, and the increasingly successful resistance of the Christian faith to Hitlerism. But both in the United States and during my recent visit to England I have encountered a hard core of disbelief or incredulity among Christians who seem reluctant, despite their admiration for Pastor Niemöller, to credit the German Church with anything more than wishy-washy indecision or, in fact, supine acquiescence.

Recent Achievements

Granting that the German Church is guilty of gross sins both of omission and commission (what church is not?), the reports that have filtered out of the Reich in the last year are particularly gratifying, not merely because they tempt some of us to say "I told you so!" but because they reveal the true extent of unsuspected Christian activity.

Let me list some of the major victories of the Church in the last couple of years. They are the result of *direct action* on the part of Christian leaders. *First of all*, two separate attempts on the part of rabid Nazis to dissolve the German Church within the last two years have been thwarted without compromise; *second*, German home missions have been snatched from "co-ordination" into the Nazi Welfare Agency (NSV); *third*, Christian churches in the annexed areas (e.g., Poland and Alsace) have been rescued from the acute danger of dissolution; *fourth*, the reason we do not hear about euthanasia (mercy killing) any more is that an aroused Christian public opinion put a stop to it when even the medical profession was powerless; *fifth*, religious education has been extended into postconfirmation and adult groups throughout the country; *sixth*, a nation-wide evangelistic program has been instituted and is spreading with great success particularly in industrial areas like the Ruhr; *seventh*, Christian contacts with organized labor have been greatly increased to mutual advantage; *eighth*, Christian ministry has brought incalculable amelioration to the plight of prisoners-of-war, especially the Russians whom the Red Cross could not reach; *ninth*, sympathetic friends right in the armies of occupation have enabled Christians in subjugated lands to pursue an otherwise impossible course of action; *tenth*, the German Church has exploited the war to promote a spirit of ecumenicity at home, in occupied countries

¹ See the writer's *It's Your Souls We Want*.

and even on the German front through the work of chaplains.

The time when Hitler with impunity might have deprived the German Church of its corporative rights is irretrievably gone. Before the war his policy was based on his belief that the Church would die a natural death, and a large number of German church-members agreed with him. Apparently he was convinced at the outbreak of war that a quick Nazi conquest of Europe would only hasten the demise. But in the last two years, beginning with the Russian campaign, new spiritual strength has risen rapidly in the supposedly superannuated church. This access of new power has already reached high government circles.

Coincident with an attempt to replace Christian confirmation in March, 1942, with a Nazi Pledgeday there occurred an attempt to disinherit the Church, but the two great bodies of Christians mobilized their forces to such a good effect that some high government officials threatened to resign if the Church were touched. Again and again come reports of the intervention of influential state or army officers in matters concerning the Church. Holland is an outstanding example. Dutch Church leaders do not deny that their successful opposition to typical Nazi measures (such as the Jewish persecution) is largely owing to the partial protection afforded by friendly Germans! Most Germans, it must be remembered, would not dare to expose themselves without the moral support of the Christian communion at home.

The German Army had always used Christian faith to bolster troop-morale but now the nazified High Command has substituted Rosenberg's ideology for Christian principles. This *ersatz* has proved to be a disappointment and, as a consequence, many of the lesser officers have given loose rein to the chaplains and even to the enlisted ministers to work freely in the ranks. The government saw the danger too late and its attempts to displace the chaplains or to forbid drafted ministers to perform pastoral functions are being disregarded. The Roman Church has protested against what it believes to be a fixed policy of the Nazi regime to decimate the ranks of the clergy by exposing priests and pastors to unusual dangers which have occasioned an average 10 per cent loss of life in this one professional category. In certain instances religious orders or seminaries have lost 15 to 20 per cent of their men at the front. On the other hand, many of the clergy have been decorated for bravery and this—together with their exemplary conduct in camp life—have exercised great influence over the minds of religiously indifferent soldiers and officers. Owing to the wholesale dilution of Himmler's S.S. Army in an effort to achieve military domination by weight of numbers, the "corrupting influence" of Christianity is even at work within that citadel of Nazism where Hitlerism must

make its final stand. Not even I in my most sanguine moments would have anticipated such a development so soon. But, on good authority, that is the latest report from inside the Reich. Of course there are no chaplains in the S.S. Army but in the first-aid stations and hospitals thousands of Bibles and religious tracts are circulating even though new printings have become virtually impossible.

German Youth

As a result of the leavening activity of several thousand pastors, the Christian Student Movement has seized a new hold on German youths. Of course, this is true not only at the front under the spiritual demands of bitter warfare but at home among the youngsters in whom a sense of disappointment and disillusionment is growing. Statistical records show that large numbers of German boys and girls are being effectively "immunized" (as one account says) against the blandishments of Hitlerian ideology.

In Pomerania at about the time of the nation-wide Nazi "confirmation," to which I referred above, mass arrests of Bible Study groups (aged 16 and 17) were resorted to without shaking the Christian testimony of youths. On the Catholic side, a group of boys in Baden requested the promised permission to leave a Hitler Youth camp for Sunday service. At first they were refused but their tenacity won out and 400 of them marched off to participate in the communion service.

A further illustration: in the Rhineland last summer there was held a training camp for 18-year-old boys who were being prepared for the army. The camp was organized by the S.S. to secure candidates for the S.S. Army and many inducements—better pay, faster promotion, favored status in civilian life—were offered. But of 200 boys only 16 registered in this anti-Christian organization!

It cannot be denied that a certain amount of re-education will be necessary in Germany, but the Church has already begun the job and its quiet work has produced results. Christian confirmation today means much more than it meant a generation ago when that ceremony merely represented a kind of social debut. The reason for the change is to be found in a popular realization that Christian teaching answers certain questions which National Socialism cannot answer. Therefore catechetical instruction has taken on a new significance, and a *large majority of all German children* are still being confirmed!

Christian Leadership

Adults are looking at the Christian Church with a new interest. There is plenty of criticism in their scrutiny but the general attitude is well expressed by one of the labor representatives who meets with Christian leaders to talk over post-war plans. "Do

you know of any *other* force which can be regarded as essential for future reconstruction? If not, why do you not say that we regard in common the Christian Church as *the* essential force with which to begin rebuilding society?"

In short, the German Church—like the British and American churches—is faced with an urgent demand for still bolder leadership. The names of Martin Niemöller, Bishop von Galen, Cardinal Faulhaber, Bishop Wurm and many others are inextricably associated with the only institution that has not been subjugated by the Nazi totalitarians, namely, the Church of Christ.

Bishop Wurm, who has emerged as the acknowledged leader of the Lutheran Church, protested publicly to Dr. Goebbels last December: "In your propaganda to the Russian people you say, 'Adolf Hitler and the German Army wish to restore freedom of religion to the Russian people,' but among us in Germany you work in a quite opposite direction. You are trying to drive the German people away from the Church." He compared bluntly the flood of anti-Christian pamphlets with the halting trickle permitted to issue from the Christian press.

Christian leadership, both Catholic and Protestant, has become bolder as a result of the popular confidence placed in it. Regular Sunday services are much better attended than they have been in many years and special "religious weeks" draw huge crowds in the industrial cities. Naturally, the preachers are not advocating political rebellion. This is not conceived to be the task of the Church. Instead there is a strong feeling that the foundations of a new order must be built in the *spirit*. The Church is quietly at work on these spiritual foundations.

However, immediate practical problems are not neglected. Where the Church was not morally strong enough to prevent violent anti-Semitic outbursts it has, of course, not been able to stop them. But when the whole story of the Christian help to the Jews is written it will be found that many a life was saved by quiet Christian intervention. The churches of Germany have never acknowledged the legality of the so-called "Aryan laws," although certain pastors approved them.

More striking is the effective aid given to Russian prisoners who were not protected by the Geneva Convention because the USSR had never signed the pact which regulates the treatment of war-prisoners. Even the Nazi government would have been glad to treat the prisoners humanely if there had been any indication of similar treatment of German prisoners in Russia. But the Russians steadfastly refused to let a single word concerning the fate of German war-prisoners reach the outside world. In spite of this situation, the German Church has been largely re-

sponsible for getting their authorities, at last, to feed and treat Russians like other prisoners.

Beyond this, countless farmers all over Germany to whom Russian and Polish prisoners had been assigned as day laborers have risked their lives to feed and clothe the men decently. I knew of cases in which estate owners carried surplus food to their prisoners secretly in the dead of night because they could not put starving men to work. They do this even though they are prohibited from worshiping in the same church with "slave labor." The Church represents the one bond they have in common.

In Occupied Lands

A great cleft today divides Nazi Germany from every other nation in Europe although each conquered country has provided a certain number of little Hitler's who have tried to pretend that the day of European union has arrived. On the other hand strong bands of fellowship now bind the German churches to the other continental communions. Incredible as it seems, the armies of occupation carried Christian ambassadors who, very quietly, are knitting church to church in a common front. Both the Roman and the Lutheran Churches in Germany have recently gone on record in opposition to the Nazi policy of occupation. Naturally, their protests were couched in language which might appeal to national self-interest. For the first time the German Church dared to criticize Nazi foreign policy but it is not the first time that aid and comfort have been supplied to the alleged "enemies."

Indeed it was the Christians from Germany who first helped the Christian forces in Norway and Holland to organize an effective resistance to the customary Nazi measures. This statement is not intended in any way to subtract from the glory of men like Bishop Berggrav in Norway and Prof. Kraemer in the Netherlands, but merely to indicate that martyrs find friends even in the midst of the enemy. A Catholic news agency (CIP) reports that six German chaplains were executed secretly for giving food to starving Greeks.

I wish it were possible to give publicity to many unsuspected aspects of the German Church situation. My purpose has been merely to present certain under-emphasized facts and to insist that, for better or worse, German Christianity is still a force to be reckoned with. Not long ago a Nazi periodical took editorial alarm in observing that the influence of religion was beginning to constitute a definite danger to National Socialism. A Berlin paper (DAZ), not owned by the Party, comes closer to the gist of the matter in connecting the rising interest in religion with the soul-shaking experiences that the nation has suffered since the start of the Russian campaign: "Christian faith gives the certainty that

the dear ones whom we have to give away will enter into the house of God through the grace of salvation."

It is interesting to hear that Dr. Goebbels, who has never been suspected of possessing any religious principles or even a moral standard, should have felt constrained to weep alligator tears amid the ruins of St. Hedwig's Catholic Cathedral in Berlin after a recent raid. But it is more interesting to hear that Protestant churches offered their sanctuaries to the Catholic congregation. The evolution of interconfessional cooperation has proceeded rapidly during the past year, albeit without the papal blessing.

The Crusade for a New World Order

G. BROMLEY OXNAM

THE Crusade for a New World Order, led by the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, is an organized effort to register the opinion of the members and constituents of the Methodist Church on the question of the participation of the United States of America in such international cooperation as may be necessary to establish world law and order.

The Crusade is based upon a three-fold conviction:

First, the religious forces of the nation must become influential at the place decision is made, *before it is made*, so that their convictions may be regarded as creative and cooperative contributions. Religious forces must not wait until decision is made and then protest.

Second, Methodists, after more than a century of missionary service throughout the world and more than a quarter century of education in the field of international relations, are world-minded and desire world order.

Third, the members of the Methodist Church, as citizens, desire such action by the United States Government as will insure full participation in, and continuing cooperation with, such international organization in the political, economic and other fields, as may be necessary to end war, to establish world law and order, economic and racial justice, and to guarantee the freedom of the individual.

But how is the opinion of the members and constituents to be registered?

By a flow of letters from our people to their representatives in Congress and in the executive branch of the Government. It is there decision will be made, and it is there the religious forces must be influential before decision is made. The letters are to be written by individuals, expressive of their own hope for an ordered world. It is believed that this expression of opinion should begin at once, mounting at times to a million letters when measures embodying moral principles are under consideration by our representatives. Members of the Congress are properly responsive to the real opinion of their constituents. They are not impressed by propaganda petitions, form letters, resolutions. They resent the coercive tactics of pressure groups. But they do want to know what their constituents think. It is as

The one great threat to the German Church now is the lack of students for the ministry. Parishes are falling vacant in great numbers and it is becoming increasingly difficult to capitalize on the reviving religious interest of the people. Perhaps there is a second threat even greater than the first, namely, that British and American Christians by some un-Christian act in connection with the prosecution of the war or, as is more likely, in connection with the planning of peace may jeopardize or discredit the faith which the German people seem to be depositing once more in the spiritual leadership provided by their church.

necessary to bring out the *opinions* as it is to bring out the *vote*.

This Crusade does not contemplate any action where-in the Church crosses the line that properly separates Church and State. But it does recognize that churchmen are citizens, and as citizens are responsible for the expression of their opinion in a democratic society. Too often majority forces of good are beaten by minority forces of evil, because they lack organization and their voice fails to reach their representatives. Our people want a just and enduring peace. It is our responsibility to make that desire known to our representatives. Such expression is in no sense partisan. It will be made known to Republican and Democrat alike.

The present membership of the Methodist Church in the United States is 7,813,901. One person in seventeen of the total population belongs to this communion. Constituency figures are generally reached by multiplying membership by $2\frac{1}{2}$; thus the constituency may be stated roughly as approximately twenty millions. The Roman Catholic Church is called upon to furnish approximately 25 per cent of the chaplains for the United States Army; the Methodist Church is called upon to furnish approximately 20 per cent. The organization of the Church, with its thirty-two bishops, five hundred seventy-eight district superintendents, makes it possible to move with dispatch and unity toward determined goals.

What are the principal features of this united movement? They have been stated in a summary of the Crusade plan as follows:

First, to multiply our power by concentrating the full strength of the Church upon a single objective, namely the expression of our opinion to our representatives. This involves the cooperation of every pastor, district superintendent and bishop, of every member of the Church, of all boards and commissions, the Church press and all other agencies of information.

Second, a series of mass meetings in one hundred great centers of population, in which the World Mission of the Church and the Crusade for a New World Order will be presented. These meetings will be under the

leadership of the Council of Bishops and the theme will be The Coming Peace and the Prince of Peace.

Third, the Day of Consecration. Upon an appropriate Sunday in the Lenten period of 1944, the Church will observe a Day of Consecration. This will not be an appeal for money. It will be a consecration of the people called Methodists to Jesus Christ as personal and world Saviour. Loyalty to Christ will be interpreted as the complete gift of self to our Lord, and the expression of that loyalty in support of those great moral measures designed to bring law, justice and brotherhood to a warring world. Upon this Day of Consecration the Church will proclaim, "He saves the Individual. He must save the World."

The Crusade for a New World Order is in no sense a substitute for the nation-wide plans of the Federal Council's Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace. The Crusade for a New World Order will cooperate in centering attention upon the Six Pillars of Peace adopted by the Federal Council. But Methodists believe it necessary to move from the public meetings to the local parish so that the individual member may be reached, and the individual may express his personal opinion to his representative in the Congress. The curriculum material of the youth and adult divisions of the Church School has been rewritten, and the entire Church in its educational program will center attention upon the objectives of the Crusade during the fall months. The Church press will keep the Crusade in the mind of the nation-wide Church. The Commission has recommended the following for the local parish.

First, see that large numbers from the parish attend the mass meeting.

Second, start the flow of letters at once. Organize a committee for house-to-house visitation. Present the issue: International Cooperation and the possibility of enduring peace, or Isolationism and the certainty of continuing war. Regard this visitation as an evangelistic opportunity, in which our people are won for the Lord as Personal Saviour, yes, but also as World Saviour. Make it clear that Christianity calls for world order, world justice, world brotherhood. Urge the members, all of them as individuals, to write at least once a month. Let mothers and fathers tell their representatives that they have given their sons that freedom may endure, but they want a world in which war shall be no more. Let every boy and girl write. They will be voters tomorrow, and desire a world in which their talents may be used to serve mankind. Let every minister write, stressing the claims of our faith and its clear call for world unity. There must be no return to power politics. There must be international cooperation.

Third, distribute the Prayer for World Order and request that it be repeated in each household once a day.

Fourth, secure the cooperation of other churches, schools, service clubs. Urge them to call upon their members to write.

Fifth, secure sufficient copies of the *Primer for Action* that will be distributed at the mass meetings, so that every member may possess one.

Sixth, write the soldiers and sailors from each church and tell them of the plans for an ordered world when at last victory is won.

Seventh, pray for the success of the Crusade in daily devotions, and cooperate in the Day of Consecration.

The World Church: News and Notes

"A Christian Message on World Order"

SIXTY-TWO Christian leaders from fourteen nations met in conference at Princeton from July 8 to 11 "to provide further information, through an assembling of competent opinion, on issues wherein the application of Christian principles and of the political propositions derived therefrom involves peculiar difficulties and complexities; to promote a better understanding of the views held by Christians in different countries; and to formulate, in so far as possible, a consensus of views on post-war reconstruction." The membership embraced delegates from the Churches of Australia, Canada, Great Britain and New Zealand who had journeyed to the United States for this purpose, five prominent Chinese now in America, Christians presently exiled from Germany, Holland, Japan, Norway, Poland and Russia, and former missionaries with intimate familiarity of most of the other great areas of the world. Over a third of the participants were laymen including a number of eminent political scientists, international lawyers, and persons high in Government office, but attending in their private capacities as lay Christians.

The report of the Conference bears the caption "A Christian Message on World Order" and falls into two

main sections. The first, addressed "to the world," reaffirms underlying Christian presuppositions (some of which material is summarized in Professor Bennett's article in another column in this issue) and then treats of "The Future of World Order." The second section is directed to the churches and outlines "The Role of the Church." Appended statements discuss the Christian attitude toward Germany, Japan and Russia (see our editorial, p. 1). The Conference also adopted a "Message" to Christians alienated by barriers of war but steadfast in the Faith. We give the section on "The Future of World Order" and the latter "Message":

The Future of World Order

Concern for world order is for us an imperative obligation inherent in the Christian world-view—in its doctrine of God and of man. A weary and frustrated world needs and desires a clear statement of a goal toward which to strive. Therefore there is demanded of us a positive affirmation of our faith and purpose as directed toward the problem of world order. Such an affirmation should arouse a spirit more dynamic than that which impels other movements seeking universal acceptance, because our faith and purpose are derived from the conviction that they are in conformity with God's

purpose in history and are therefore required by Divine mandate.

We are committed to the goal of a world-wide political order, and thus to the establishment of the institutions or organizations best suited to serve the purpose of this order—not because world government as such is a distinctive Christian objective, but because this is a necessary condition of the unified spiritual society which is our Christian objective. The need for action is urgent. Failure to grasp our opportunity will invite the misfortune of mankind. We recognize, however, that our objective may not be fully attainable at a single step but may have to be evolved through intermediate developments. We are concerned, therefore, both with the goal and with the program of next steps—international conferences and the administration of relief and reconstruction, for example. These next steps must be consonant with the goal; otherwise they may lead away from it.

I. Principles Fundamental to World Order

Certain principles must be accepted with which both the world-wide organizations for world order and the immediate steps must conform:

- (1) The imperative of moral law;
- (2) The worth of every human being;
- (3) The precedence of human over material values and considerations;
- (4) The individual's responsibility for collective action taken in his name;
- (5) The moral duty of cooperative action.

These principles must not be compromised out of considerations of expediency. On the other hand, we realize that no institution can give them full expression.

If the progressively achieved world organization effectively serves the values inherent in these principles and consequently assures national security, it will win the loyalty of nations and will not depend for its support primarily upon treaty obligations or imposed force.

II. Certain Political Propositions

In order to bring about the initial and vital decision on the direction in which nations will move, we set forth six political propositions heretofore formulated by the Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace.

(Here follow the "Six Pillars of Peace," given in our recent issues.)

III. Requirements for Progress Toward World Order

Progress toward our goal will require:

- (1) That national isolationism, the monopolization of political power by a few nations, and the balance of power which hitherto have failed to maintain peace, be repudiated as policies which contravene the purpose of establishing world order and the institutions requisite thereto.
- (2) That temporary collaboration among the United Nations should, as quickly as possible, give way to a universal order and not be consolidated into a closed military alliance to establish a preponderance of power or a concert of power.
- (3) That drastic reduction in armaments be under-

taken as steps toward the goals envisaged in the Atlantic Charter of the "abandonment of the use of force" and lifting from the peoples of the world "the crushing burden of armaments."

(4) That immediate international collaboration such as is involved in (a) conferences dealing with specific problems and in (b) the administration of relief and reconstruction be guarded against exploitation for purposes of power politics.

(5) That if regional organizations arise, they be part of an inclusive world order and shall not threaten the interests of world organization.

(6) That a larger measure of discipline and sacrifice for the good of the whole world community be practiced by each nation as necessary to the good of that nation as a part of the community.

(7) That individual citizens recognize their responsibility for their collective decisions as reflected in national policies.

(8) That ethical and moral standards recognized as applying to individual conduct be recognized as applying also to group, corporate, and national conduct.

(9) That cultural and social collaborations be established, along with political collaboration, as essential for the achievement of world order.

(10) That an adequate motivation be developed in the will of the peoples of the world to support the agencies and arrangements for cooperation, so that the sense of national destiny which has hitherto led nations to seek national aggrandizement, shall hereafter find its expression in work that promote the general welfare of mankind.

A message to the many Christians separated from us by the barriers of war who remain steadfast in the Faith:

We who address you are a group of Christian men and women who have come together from fourteen lands. We have met to rededicate ourselves to the task of seeking that out of this war will come a just and durable peace. Throughout our proceedings, thought of you has been constantly in our minds.

We want you to know of our deep sense of obligation to you. Despite long years of attempted suppression and oftentimes of persecution your faith in God as revealed by Jesus Christ has not weakened. Indeed, it has grown stronger until it is now a flaming symbol that all men see. The Christian faith elsewhere has been inspired and nourished by your example.

You have taught us to see better the true meaning of life and what it is that is worth striving for and, if need be, dying for. You have shown us the practice of human fellowship. We are made ashamed that we have done so little where you have risked so much. We have pledged ourselves to new efforts to prevent intolerance anywhere and to secure recognition of the essential dignity of human beings everywhere, without regard for nation, race or creed.

We long to come to you in person and to bring you some material succor and to receive from you the fuller stimulus of your spiritual vigor. We hope and believe that the time for that is not far distant. We know that there must still be much agony of body and soul. But the end is in sight.

When that end comes we hope that the power of the

nations will thereafter be made the servant of righteous government and of world order. To assure that will be a task of the Christian forces. We do not minimize the difficulties which confront us. But the vigor of our component parts is now such that we can work mightily once we can again work in unison and freely reinforce one another. More and more is the world receptive, recognizing that moral force provides a basic foundation upon which justice and order can be reestablished where all else has been swept away. May the Lord God strengthen your faith and our faith, that we may better serve His holy purpose.

Heroism in Greece

The Swiss paper *Semur Vaudois* reports a dramatic action by the Orthodox clergy of Greece against the execution of hostages by the German authorities in retaliation for acts of sabotage, activities of guerrillas, etc.:

"Some months ago the German authorities received the Metropolitan of Athens in private audience. He went straight to the point:

"I protest," he said in substance, 'against this violation of the rights of the person. You believe that the massacre of innocent people is indispensable for the maintenance of order. Allow me to inform you of those who could eventually die if need be, and those who ought not to die. You kill fathers; after their death their families are broken without support, without bread. You kill sons; after their death their families lose a moral and material support, a pillar very often unique and irreplaceable. You proceed to take intellectuals, men of great value, as hostages. I have with me a list of persons whom you could shoot, without society suffering immeasurably by it, without their loss occasioning the ruin of the home.'

"Show us this list."

"The Metropolitan offered several sheets of paper to the German Chief. At the head of the list was his own name. There followed the names of all the Greek clergy."

It is reported that the German authorities have declined to accept the offer.

A Negro Heads the L. M. S.

Dr. Harold Moody, a Jamaican, for many years president of the League of Colored Peoples, has been made chairman of the London Missionary Society, one of the great Free Church missionary bodies of Great Britain. In a letter to the League of Colored People, Moody writes:

"I now go forward with your blessing and prayers. I represent you and pray God my occupancy of this position will do much to help improve relationships between black and white and hasten the day when for all appointments, either of the Church or the State, the question will not be what is his color, but what is his character and ability."

The Generalissimo and Missions

At a recent conference of the National Christian Council of China in Chungking, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek praised the Christian Church and its missions.

Speaking of the Missionary Societies, he said:

"We still need them and welcome Christians from other lands who serve the people of China with true sympathy and devotion. Don't feel you are guests. You are comrades working with us to save our people and build a new nation.

"Christians from abroad and Christians in China are on the same footing and can work wholeheartedly together for the reconstruction of China. From now on there should be much closer relations between the Chinese and Western Christians."

Protestant Church Council in Algiers

The American office of the World Council of Churches has received a cable message from Algiers that a Protestant Church Council, including in its membership all non-Roman church bodies, has just been formed. The chairman of the Council is Pastor André Boegner, the brother of Dr. Marc Boegner, president of the Protestant Federation in France and a vice-chairman of the Provisional Committee of the World Council.

I.C.P.I.S.

Anti-Semitism in Holland

The Nazified Dutch press recently announced:

"Today, June 4, 1943, the Jewish problem has been solved. The last of the Dutch Jews herded together in Amsterdam have been sent to concentration camps, there to await their final deportation eastwards."

It is estimated that 180,000 Netherland citizens of Jewish blood have been exterminated. Only Jews who are married to Christian women have escaped this mass murder and deportation. The German authorities have now begun the systematic sterilization of such Jews who have been given the alternative of submitting to the operation or being deported to almost certain death in Poland. This policy has been vigorously protested in a statement submitted to Reich Commissioner Seyss-Inquart and signed jointly by the Roman Catholic Archbishop and the official leaders of the Netherland Reformed, Calvinist, Baptist, Lutheran and other Dutch churches. The statement reads in part:

"Sterilization constitutes a physical and spiritual mutilation directly at variance with the divine commandment that we shall not dishonor, hate, wound or kill our neighbors. Sterilization constitutes a violation of divine commandments as well as of human rights. . . .

"It is the duty of Your Excellency to stop the shameful practice of sterilization. We do not have illusions. We are well aware that we can hardly expect that Your Excellency will heed the voice of the Church, which is the voice of the gospel and which is the voice of God. But what we cannot expect as human beings, we dare to hope for in our faith in Christ.

"The living God has the power to convert and change also Your Excellency's heart. For that we also ask God, for the good of Your Excellency and for our suffering people."

French Churches Protest Forced Labor

The following message, protest against the forced requisition of labor, was read in all the Protestant churches of France on Sunday, May 2nd:

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| JOHN C. BENNETT | RHODA E. McCULLOCH |
| CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM | FRANCIS P. MILLER |
| F. ERNEST JOHNSON | EDWARD L. PARSONS |
| HENRY SMITH LEIPER | HOWARD C. ROBBINS |
| JOHN A. MACKAY | HENRY P. VAN DUSEN |

DOROTHY CLEMENS, *Editorial Assistant*

"There is an irreducible opposition between the Gospel which the Church has received in trust and any conception of man or society which tends to envisage labor as a merchandise which one has a right to buy or requisition at will, without regard to the person, the conscience, or the most sacred feelings of the laborer. . .

"As for those who have already gone, the Church is doing its best to make up for its inability to send French pastors among them. In so far as it knows the addresses of French Protestant workers in Germany, it is endeavoring to bring them together and put them in touch with one another; it is sending them periodicals or special publications, and maintaining with them a correspondence of such a kind as to keep them in an atmosphere of Christian solicitude and living piety. . ."

Doctors Kraemer and Berdyaev

It is reported that Professor Hendrick Kraemer, distinguished theologian and clergyman, leader of Holland who has been held as a hostage because of his prominence in the resistance of the Dutch churches, has been released from concentration camp on grounds of health.

It is now learned authoritatively that the rumor of the arrest of Professor Nicolas Berdyaev, reported in our issue of May 17, 1943, is false.

Training for Rehabilitation

Three theological schools in Berkeley, California, are joining forces to sponsor a Program of Training for Post-War Rehabilitation designed to prepare its students for short-term Christian service in needy areas of Europe and Asia. The curriculum will cover four major fields—courses for the understanding of the region to which the worker will go, courses in principles and methods of personal and community rehabilitation, language courses and courses designed to strengthen the religious resources of the worker. Opening on September 6th, the school will continue for forty-eight weeks. It is open to men and women "who in addition to a college degree or its equivalent have physical endurance, emotional stability and spiritual imagination."

Public Library

Woodward & Kirby Aves.
Detroit, Mich.

65C 1-44

Schism in the Russian Church

C. L. Sulzberger, correspondent of the *New York Times*, reported from Moscow on July 1: "Several of the leading prelates of the Orthodox Russian Church have deserted from the organization headed by the Patriarchal incumbent, Sergius, Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna, whose ecclesiastical authority as the chief of the Orthodox worshipers in the Soviet Union is recognized by the Soviet Government.

"The dissidents have begun open cooperation with Axis occupying forces in the western territories and with the German-sponsored group of Orthodox Bishops who proclaimed themselves the true representatives of Russian orthodoxy at the ecclesiastical council of Karlova in Yugoslavia a few years ago.

"As the result of this schism in Russian orthodoxy, a considerable number of Russian priests will face expulsion from holy orders by Metropolitan Sergius upon the conclusion of the war.

"The renegade prelates include some of the leading names of the Russian clergy. . ."

Quisling to Be Asked to Fill Empty Churches

A letter carrying the signatures of all Quisling clergymen in Norway will be sent to Premier Vidkun Quisling, asking him to solve the "unbearable situation" of the empty churches in which they preach, according to an article in the Stockholm newspaper *Nya Dagligt Allehanda*.

The letter will point out that religious services cannot be suspended entirely, for the Quisling party would then be accused of religious differences, the article said.

However, many Quisling pastors are on the "verge of a nervous breakdown" from the strain of preaching to empty pews. They therefore suggest that church attendance by Quisling party members be made obligatory, in the same manner that attendance at party meetings is compulsory, the paper added.

Late Cables from Geneva

Hungary: The Lutheran Church of Hungary has accepted the World Council of Churches' invitation to join that body.

Prague: The Bible Society publishing House and Bookshop have been closed by the authorities.

Switzerland: On Sunday, June 27, there were services of mourning for persecuted Jews in all synagogues in Switzerland; at the service in Geneva the World Council of Churches Secretariat was represented. An open letter was sent by Swiss pastors to the Jewish community, in which they expressed their deep sympathy and repentance that Christians did not begin fighting anti-Semitism in time.

Authors in This Issue

Stewart W. Herman, Jr., was pastor of the American Church in Berlin from 1936 to 1941.

John Coleman Bennett is Professor of Christian Theology and Ethics at Union Theological Seminary.

Samuel McCrea Cavert is General Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

G. Bromley Oxnam is the Resident Bishop of the Boston Area of the Methodist Church.